UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,332	04/06/2001	Michael Kelbaugh	723-1081	6939

27562   7590   05/15/2007
NIXON & VANDERHYE, P.C.
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER
RAMPURIA, SATISH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2191	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/827,332	KELBAUGH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Satish S. Rampuria	2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _16 February 2007_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-21,23-61 and 63-85_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-21,23-61 and 63-85_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

1.   This action is in response to the communication filed on February 16, 2007.

2.   Claims cancelled by the Applicant: 22 and 62.

3.   Claims amended by the Applicant: 1-6, 17, 21, 23-27, 35, 38, 41-47, 57, 61, 63-67, 75-

78, and 81.

4.   Claims 1-21, 23-61, 63-85 are pending.

5.   This is a non-final action due to as indicated in the Advisory action that Claim 27 was not

addressed in the Non-Final office action mailed on 12/18/2005, therefore, the finality of

the action mailed on 9/21/2006 is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but they are not

persuasive.

In the remarks, the applicant has argued that:

        Applicants argued that even if the teachings of Wygodny are combined with

those of Othmer, the combination fails to teach "at least one bug tracking related menu,

the contents of which vary based on the user's role in the software development

process."

Examiner's response:

        In response to Applicant argument, it is noted that the rejection clearly points out

where Othmer and Wygodny teach the claimed features and why it would have been

obvious to combine their teachings. Othmer discloses monitoring the operations of

computer based systems connected to a server (see the summary), specifically Othmer

disclose the server uses the user ID to associate static information with a particular

client machine (col. 13, lines 48-64). Wygodny discloses in a remote mode developer

uses the program called the BugTrapper analyzer to create a trace file. The analyzer

obtains information about the client at the compile time for the specific client (col. 5,

lines 25-53). as understood from the Applicants specification and drawings that menu is

the information displayed to the user depending on their role i.e., tester, developer, or

project coordinator etc. (Specification, page 14). Wygodny explicitly discloses menu is

diplayued to user (in this case developer) to select the execution files (col. 12, lines 3-

21). Applicant only makes general allegations and does not point out any errors in the

rejection. Rather, in response to Applicant's arguments against the references

individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually

where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642

F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ

375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Therefore, the rejection is proper and maintained herein.

In the remarks, the applicant has argued that:

Othmer does not teach the claimed "determining the aspects of a system that a

user is entitled to access based on a user's role in the development process." Othmer

teaches using a user ID, but fails to teach or suggest "determining the aspects of a

system that a user is entitled to access based on a user's role in the development

process."

Examiner's response:

In response to Applicant argument, the argument is similar to those discussed

above, and applies under the same rational set forth above.

In the remarks, the applicant has argued that:

Further, with respect to these claims, Johndrew fails to remedy the above

described deficiencies of Othmer and Wygodny. Moreover, Johndrew does not, as page

18 of the Office Action suggests, disclose a method of sorting bugs "wherein said

sorting criteria includes video game stage or a video game character or the status of the

bug or the type of bug or the reported date of the bug." Johndrew does not teach

allowing a user to sort bugs based on a video game stage, a video game character, the

status of a bug, or a reported date of a bug. Under Johndrew's teachings, a user would,

for example, have no use in searching for "the reported date of a bug," since a user

would not care when a bug was reported. The date of a software patch fixing the bug,

as Johndrew discloses, is not the same as the reported date of the bug. The former is

useful to a user, while the latter is of practical use for a developer.

Examiner's response:

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., allowing a user...) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). further, Johndrew clearly indicates sorting criteria based up on the status of a bug, or a reported date of a bug; see office action mailed on 9/21/2006 page 18-19.

In the remarks, the applicant has argued that:

Claims 17, 38, 57 and 78 were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Othmer and Wygodny in view of admitted prior art (applicants' specification, page 2, lines 9-11, hereinafter "prior art"). Claims 19, 40, 59 and 79 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Othmer in view of Tse (U.S. Patent No. 5,742,754, hereinafter "Tse"). Applicants note that many of the above-indicated dependent claims recite additional specific features which are not disclosed or even remotely suggested by the prior art. Since the independent base claims of each of these dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above, there is no present need to address any of these issues in detail.

Examiner's response:

In response to applicant argument, Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37

CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or

she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references

cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid

such references or objections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this
title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a
whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said
subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 1-8, 14-16, 18, 20-27, 28, 29, 35-37, 39-48, 54-56, 58, 60-69, 75-77, 80, and 81-

85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.

6,167,358 to Othmer et al., hereinafter called Othmer, in view of US Patent No.

6,282,701 to Wygodny et al., hereinafter called Wygodny.

Per claims 1, 6, 18, 21, 22, 27, 39, 42, 47, and 58:

Othmer disclose:

- A method for processing and monitoring software bug related information for use in

    software package development (col. 2, lines 30-33 "a system and method for remotely

    monitoring a plurality of computer-based systems is provided which detects defects

    (bugs) or the usage of particular functions in a software application") comprising the

    steps of:

- accessing an Internet browser (col. 1, lines 25-27 "With the Internet, the process...

  testing requires... developer place the beta software application on its web site");

- accessing a bug tracking system using said Internet browser (col. 9, lines 5-7 "the server

  may interface with, communicate and share data with one or more existing bug

  tracking");

- processing user identification information including a password (col. 13, lines 59-60

  "The server uses the user ID to associate static information with a particular client

  machine"); and

- accessing, in response to said user identification information (col. 14, lines 7-9 "The

  server uses the user ID to associate static information with a particular client machine and

  to keep a record about a particular user")

Othmer does not explicitly disclose at least one bug tracking related menu tailored to the user's

role in the software development process.

However, Wygodny discloses in an analogous computer system at least one bug tracking

related menu tailored to the user's role in the software development process (col. 5, lines 26-30

"developer 112 uses a program called the BugTrapper analyzer 106 to create a file called a trace

control information (TCI) file 120. The TCI file 120 contains instructions that specify what

information is to be collected from a program to be traced" and FIGS. 1A through 1C and

related discussion).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate the method of bug tracking related menu tailored to the

user's role in the software development process as taught by Wygodny into the method for monitoring the software bug as taught by Othmer. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide the menu or trace data file of the execution of a program to debug the problems in parallel processing as suggested by Wygodny (col. 2, lines 27-49).

Per claim 41:

Othmer disclose:

- A method of processing and monitoring software bug related information for use in software package development (col. 2, lines 30-33 "a system and method for remotely monitoring a plurality of computer-based systems is provided which detects defects (bugs) or the usage of particular functions in a software application") comprising the steps of:

- accessing a bug tracking system via the Internet (col. 9, lines 5-7 "the server may interface with, communicate and share data with one or more existing bug tracking");

- processing user identification information including a password (col. 13, lines 59-60 "The server uses the user ID to associate static information with a particular client machine"), wherein the processing includes determining the aspects of a system that a user is entitled to access based on a user's role in the development process (col. 14, lines 7-9 "The server uses the user ID to associate static information with a particular client machine and to keep a record about a particular user");

- sorting said list of bugs in accordance with any of one a plurality of user selected sort

 criteria (col. 5, lines 28-30 "each data element in a black box... have a timestamp

 associated with it... user of the system... determine a sequence of events that occurred

 prior to a triggering event").

Othmer does not explicitly disclose retrieving from a database associated with said bug tracking

system a list of bugs associated with an identified software package.

However, Wygodny discloses in an analogous computer system retrieving from a

database associated with said bug tracking system a list of bugs associated with an identified

software package (col. 5, lines 26-30 "developer 112 uses a program called the BugTrapper

analyzer 106 to create a file called a trace control information (TCI) file 120. The TCI file 120

contains instructions that specify what information is to be collected from a program to be

traced" and FIGS. 1A through 1C and related discussion).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate the method of bug tracking related menu tailored to the

user's role in the software development process as taught by Wygodny into the method for

monitoring the software bug as taught by Othmer. The modification would be obvious because

of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide the menu or trace data file of the

execution of a program to debug the problems in parallel processing as suggested by Wygodny

(col. 2, lines 27-49).

Per claims 2-5, 23-26, and 43-46:

The rejection of claims 1, 21, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, Othmer does not explicitly disclose the user is a video game tester and wherein said step of accessing said bug tracking related menu includes the step of accessing a bug tracking related menu tailored to video game testers.

However, Wygodny discloses in an analogous computer system the user is a video game tester and wherein said step of accessing said bug tracking related menu includes the step of accessing a bug tracking related menu tailored to video game testers (col. 5, lines 26-30 "developer 112 uses a program called the BugTrapper analyzer 106 to create a file called a trace control information (TCI) file 120. The TCI file 120 contains instructions that specify what information is to be collected from a program to be traced" and FIGS. 1A through 1C and related discussion).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of bug tracking related menu tailored to the user's role in the software development process as taught by Wygodny into the method for monitoring the software bug as taught by Othmer. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide the menu or trace data file of the execution of a program to debug the problems in parallel processing as suggested by Wygodny (col. 2, lines 27-49).

Per claims 7 and 28:

The rejection of claim 1, and 21is incorporated, respectively, and further, Othmer disclose:

- accessing a master bug log identifying a plurality of bugs in a selected software package under development (col. 6, lines 55-60 "based on the large amount of black box information (e.g., the black boxes from the thousands of client computers that are using the beta browser software and have a nub), what caused the crash (i.e., a user error, a web site error or a bug) and then provide, for a bug, a patch to each of the client computers running the new browser software")

Per claims 8, 29, and 48:

The rejection of claims 1, 21, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, Othmer disclose:

- accessing a database and retrieving data indicative of a plurality of bugs in a selected software package (col. 6, lines 55-60 "based on the large amount of black box information (e.g., the black boxes from the thousands of client computers that are using the beta browser software and have a nub), what caused the crash (i.e., a user error, a web site error or a bug) and then provide, for a bug, a patch to each of the client computers running the new browser software"); and

- sorting the bugs based upon any one of a plurality of sorting criteria selected by a user (col. 5, lines 28-30 "each data element in a black box... have a timestamp associated with it... user of the system... determine a sequence of events that occurred prior to a triggering event")

Per claim 14-16, 35-37, and 54-56:

The rejection of claim 1, 21, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, Othmer disclose:

- transmitting a bug related message (col. 5, lines 11-12 "data gathered by the nub may be

collected into a "black box" data structure 44 that may be transmitted over the

communications link to the server").

Othmer does not explicitly disclose using an accessed bug related menu from a first user having

a first role in developing said software package to a second user having a second role in

developing said software package.

However, Wygodny discloses in an analogous computer system using an accessed bug

related menu from a first user having a first role in developing said software package to a

second user having a second role in developing said software package (col. 5, lines 26-30

"developer 112 uses a program called the BugTrapper analyzer 106 to create a file called a trace

control information (TCI) file 120. The TCI file 120 contains instructions that specify what

information is to be collected from a program to be traced" and FIGS. 1A through 1C and

related discussion).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate the method of bug tracking related menu tailored to the

user's role in the software development process as taught by Wygodny into the method for

monitoring the software bug as taught by Othmer. The modification would be obvious because

of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide the menu or trace data file of the

execution of a program to debug the problems in parallel processing as suggested by Wygodny

(col. 2, lines 27-49).

Per claims 20 and 60:

The rejection of claims 1 and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, Othmer does not explicitly disclose editing bug related information using said at least one bug tracking related menu.

Othmer does not explicitly disclose editing bug related information using said at least one bug tracking related menu.

However, Wygodny discloses in an analogous computer system editing bug related information using said at least one bug tracking related menu (col. 5, lines 26-30 "developer 112 uses a program called the BugTrapper analyzer 106 to create a file called a trace control information (TCI) file 120. The TCI file 120 contains instructions that specify what information is to be collected from a program to be traced" and FIGS. 1A through 1C and related discussion).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of bug tracking related menu tailored to the user's role in the software development process as taught by Wygodny into the method for monitoring the software bug as taught by Othmer. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide the menu or trace data file of the execution of a program to debug the problems in parallel processing as suggested by Wygodny (col. 2, lines 27-49).

Claims 61, 62 are the system claim corresponding to method claim 1 and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 1 above.

Claims 63-69 are the system claim corresponding to method claims 2-8, respectively, and

rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 2-8,

respectively above.

Claims 75-77 are the system claim corresponding to method claims 14-16, respectively, and

rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 14-16,

respectively above.

Claim 80 is the system claim corresponding to method claim 20 and rejected under the same

rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 20 above.

Per claim 81:

Othmer disclose:

- A method for processing and monitoring software bug related   information for use in

  software package development (col. 2, lines 30-33 "a system and method for remotely

  monitoring a plurality of computer-based systems is provided which detects defects

  (bugs) or the usage of particular functions in a software application") comprising the

  steps of:

- enabling access to a bug tracking system using an Internet browser (col. 9, lines 5-7 "the

  server may interface with, communicate and share data with one or more existing bug

  tracking");

- processing user identification information including a password (col. 13, lines 59-60

  "The server uses the user ID to associate static information with a particular client

  machine") from a first user having a role in the software development process which is

different from a role of at least a second user's in the software development process (col. 14, lines 7-9 "The server uses the user ID to associate static information with a particular client machine and to keep a record about a particular user");

- accessing, in response to said user information from the first user, at least a first bug tracking related menu specifically tailored to the first user's role in the software development process;

- processing user identification information including a password from the second user col. 13, lines 59-60 "The server uses the user ID to associate static information with a particular client machine"), and

- accessing, in response to said user identification information from the second user (col. 14, lines 7-9 "The server uses the user ID to associate static information with a particular client machine and to keep a record about a particular user").

Othmer does not explicitly disclose at least a second bug tracking related menu specifically tailored to the second user's role in the software development process, wherein the first and second bug tracking menus are different from each other.

However, Wygodny discloses in an analogous computer system at least a second bug tracking related menu specifically tailored to the second user's role in the software development process, wherein the first and second bug tracking menus are different from each other (col. 5, lines 26-30 "developer 112 uses a program called the BugTrapper analyzer 106 to create a file called a trace control information (TCI) file 120. The TCI file 120 contains instructions that

specify what information is to be collected from a program to be traced" and FIGS. 1A through

1C and related discussion).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate the method of bug tracking related menu tailored to the

user's role in the software development process as taught by Wygodny into the method for

monitoring the software bug as taught by Othmer. The modification would be obvious because

of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide the menu or trace data file of the

execution of a program to debug the problems in parallel processing as suggested by Wygodny

(col. 2, lines 27-49).

Per claims 82-85:

The rejection of claims 81, is incorporated, and further, Othmer does not explicitly disclose

wherein either the first or second user is a video game tester and correspondingly either the first

or second bug tracking menu is tailored to video game testers.

However, Wygodny discloses in an analogous computer system wherein either the first or

second user is a video game tester and correspondingly either the first or second bug tracking

menu is tailored to video game testers (col. 5, lines 26-30 "developer 112 uses a program called

the BugTrapper analyzer 106 to create a file called a trace control information (TCI) file 120.

The TCI file 120 contains instructions that specify what information is to be collected from a

program to be traced" and FIGS. 1A through 1C and related discussion).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate the method of bug tracking related menu tailored to the

user's role in the software development process as taught by Wygodny into the method for

monitoring the software bug as taught by Othmer. The modification would be obvious because

of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide the menu or trace data file of the

execution of a program to debug the problems in parallel processing as suggested by Wygodny

(col. 2, lines 27-49).

9.   Claims 9-13, 30-34, 49-53 and 70-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

        unpatentable over Othmer, Wygodny in view of US Pub. No. 2001/0049697 to Johndrew

        et al., hereinafter called Johndrew.

Per claims 9-13, 30-34, and 49-53:

The rejection of claims 8, 28, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, neither Othmer

nor Wygodny explicitly disclose wherein said sorting criteria includes video game stage or a

video game character or the status of the bug or the type of bug or the reported date of the bug.

        However, Johndrew discloses in an analogous computer system sorting criteria includes

video game stage or a video game character or the status of the bug or the type of bug or the

reported date of the bug (page 3 and 4, paragraph 46 "FIG. 7 shows the data collected by the

process of FIG. 6. Bug ID screen 700 includes the query component selection index 310, a bug

identifier header 705, a bug headline 710 and a release table 715. Bug identifier header 705

gives the bug identifier associated with the information on the screen... Bug headline 710

contains a short one line description of the bug... Column

725 indicates the status of the bug... Column 730 contains the date and time that software

fixing the bug").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate the method of sorting/identifying bugs based on unique

identifiers as taught by Johndrew into the method for monitoring the software bug as taught in

the combination system by Othmer and Wygodny. The modification would be obvious because

of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to sort the bugs to provide complete bugs

free software application to client as suggested by Johndrew (page 1, paragraph 10).

Claims 70-74 are the system claim corresponding to method claims 9-13, respectively, and

rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 9-13,

respectively above.

10.   Claims 17, 38, 57, and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

       Othmer, Wygodny in view of **admitted prior art.**

Per claims 17, 38, and 57:

The rejection of claims 1, 21, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, neither Othmer

nor Wygodny explicitly disclose attaching to a bug description a digitized video file for visually

displaying at least one screen display showing an identified bug.

However, admitted prior art discloses attaching to a bug description a digitized video file

for visually displaying at least one screen display showing an identified bug (Applicant's

specification, page 2, lines 9-11 "tester... associate a tester recorded sequence of game screen

displays to provide a visual depiction of the error sequence")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to incorporate the method of displaying a digitized video file for visually

displaying as taught in admitted prior art. The modification would be obvious because of one of

ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to display the bug information which is would be for

video game to have better understanding of the bugs found during testing as suggested in

admitted prior art (pages 3, lines 4-12).

Claim 78 is the system claim corresponding to method claim 17 and rejected under the same

rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 17 above.

11.   Claims 19, 40, 59, and 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

        Othmer, Wygodny in view of US Patent No. 5,742,754 to Tse, hereinafter called Tse.

Per claims 19, 40, and 59:

The rejection of claims 1, 21, and 41 is incorporated, respectively, and further, neither Othmer

nor Wygodny explicitly disclose accessing a test plan identifying a plurality of tests to be

performed with respect to an identified software package.

However, Tse discloses in an analogous computer system accessing a test plan

identifying a plurality of tests to be performed with respect to an identified software package

(col. 4, lines 30-35 "where the user defines a software product for testing, a proper test suite,

and a plurality of different computer hardware configurations for a software testing "job." The

software product being tested may be any user provided software product").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of using test plan /suite to test software application as taught by Tse into the method for monitoring the software bug as taught in the combination system by Othmer and Wygodny. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to test the software application using test plan to verify the software is functioning as expected as suggested by Tse (col. 2, lines 43-59).

Claim 79 is the system claim corresponding to method claim 19 and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 19 above, as noted above and Othmer also discloses system 50, see FIG. 2 and associated text.

Conclusion

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Satish S. Rampuria** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-3732**. The examiner can normally be reached on **8:30 am to 5:00 pm** Monday to Friday except every other Friday and federal holidays. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100**

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Wei Y. Zhen** can be reached on **(571) 272-3708**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Satish S. Rampuria
Patent Examiner/Software Engineer
Art Unit 2191

WEI ZHEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER